

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
October 22, 2002**

Interest Group Committee:

Allison Rolfe	SD Audubon
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Dave Shibley	Save Our Land Values
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Berger	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Richard Nowicki	American Institute of Architects
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values

Public at Large:

Bob Collins	City of SD, Water Dept.
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
C. Chare	
Carol Leone	
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Anderson	SDAR
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Gary Ruyle	ASLA
Gene Helsel	Julian CPG
Jeanne Pagett	
Jeff Pasek	City of SD, Water Dept.
Joe Perring	Stonegate Dev.
Lynne Baker	EHL
Sam Mitchell	Ramona CPG
Troy Murphree	Sweetwater Authority

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for October 8, 2002
 - Bowlby made a correction (pp. 4, 5th bullet) stating it should say “removing” instead of “moving.”
 - **Motion:** Bowlby moved to approve. Gendron seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item II: Interim Interest Group Map –

- Higgins requested copies of the map. Holler replied that there is only one that exists today and time can be scheduled to look at the map at DPLU. Pryor added that the maps will eventually be available, but not until we try to resolve the issues. We are going to try to get rid of as many issues as possible before we start to distribute them.
- a) Presentation by Staff (No Action)
 - Carmichael stated that the stickies on the map represent key discussion points staff still has with the map and some disagreements at this point between what staff would recommend and what the interim Interest Group map has on it today. Some of these are just general discussion items that are continuing to evolve because we are still working with the communities; some are pending discussions between the different groups of people here today and they may not necessarily be disagreements with what staff may ultimately recommend. What we have here today are highlights of changes that we still have issues with and may be recommending an alternative scenario to. We have not finalized a commercial and industrial recommendation yet, mainly because we wanted to see what the land use distribution and the population are, to then determine what the commercial and industrial means are for those various communities, as well as , being something we want to discuss with the communities. Mentioned that additional minor changes will be made as we go through and clean up the map.
 - 1, 2, and 3 – These all have pretty much the same rationale. Fallbrook is an area that is already built out and parcelized, at least with the existing patterns that are there with the existing patterns that are there with the existing General Plan and we have a lot of community support in maintaining that. The amount of change, intensified, that would occur over those areas would not be revealed in our modeling because it would be a redevelopment scenario.
 - 4 – This is just a note. The harmony Grove area is an area we see that has the potential to create a small compact community where right now, we have some defunct agricultural use in the valley floor and some egg ranches that probably have a very limited life span going year round. We feel that there is an opportunity there to actually create something that fits within our concepts and we are continuing to work with the community on that; this is not really a difference but more of a note to let you know that the effort is still going on.
 - 5 and 6 – Same type of issue. These areas have sensitive habitat and does not have a lot of development going on right now. The Interest Group map is proposing that the 1 du/20 ac go to 1 du/40 ac but talking with Tom Oberbauer and Bob Ascher (MSCP) who are working on the plan, they believe that the 1 du/20 ac design can still achieve the goals they have for the corridors and the sanctions through that area.
 - 7 and 8 – Same kind of issue. These areas are 1 du/20 ac on the working copy and proposed a 1 du/40 ac, however, we feel that the amount of parcelization that already exists in that area really lends itself better to a 1 du/20 ac designation, so we are seeing that as a difference.
 - 9 – This is kind of an overall issue. We have a proposal for Valley Center that kind of creates a lot more density to the village area than what exists today. As far as density, there is not a lot in existence here today so this would actually create a ring, like a village. This is something we are noticing as we are still working with that community. We do see Valley Center intensifying its village core, however, we do not know if we see it to this extent but we are keeping the community involved and we will keep working with them.
 - 10- This is just the difference between 1 du/10 ac area on the working copy and a 1 du/40 ac area. We feel the 1 du/10 ac designation is consistent with how we have treated agricultural areas. This is a good agricultural area with lots of groves on the steeper area, so we felt that a 1 du/10 ac would be a more appropriate density.

- 11 – These are very small, discrete areas that are 1 du/4 ac on the working copy and proposed at 1 du/ac. We felt that the 1 du/4 ac was a more appropriate designation due to the oak woodland and access issues.
- 13 – This area is 1 du/20 ac on the working copy and proposed at 1 du/40 ac. We felt that with the types of agriculture here, the 1 du/20 ac was more in keeping with the community's character and with what is going on there with regards to parcelization.
- 14 and 15 – These issues are very similar to Valley Center. We are still working with Ramona to get plans designed for their community. We expect to see some growth and not a no growth scenario. We are continuing to work with them on the core area and village center and some surrounding increased densities to support those. We are not done with the process; we would like to continue to work with the community in that area.
- 16 – This is a little different. This area is below Highland Valley Road and is a little spot of 1 du/40 ac surrounded by 1 du/2 ac. At this point, we disagree with this; we want to see a plan put together that shows clearly where the preservation would not be piecemeal. We want to see where growth could occur that gets moved out of that area.
- 17 – This area is proposed at 1 du/80 ac; the 1 du/40 ac on the working copy is more in keeping with existing parcelization so we do not support the 1 du/80 ac.
- 18 and 19 – These have the same issues. When we went through the process with Alt. 3, Potrero was community that wanted 8 acres blanketed across the community. We have been working with them and they have come along way towards the goals and objectives we have in this project; they have submitted a plan for our new review that now has 1 du/40 ac, 1 du/20 ac and 1 du/10 ac designations on it. The 1 du/10 ac mainly recognizes where existing lot patterns are at 1 du/10 ac but does allow some growth adjacent to major roadways and allows a small bit of commercial in the actual core; that is something we would like to consider very strongly because we could then have the best of both worlds with lower densities where constraints are high, we could try to reinforce a little community area and try to recognize the existing parcelization.
- 20 – This area is near Morena Village. It is proposed at 1 du/40 ac on the Interest Group map but 1 du/10 ac is a more appropriate density with the existing parcelization.
- 21 – There are two dangerous roadways that come together in this location so we are working with the community to put a small area of 1 du/4 ac (adjacent to the commercial). Change would cluster area down adjacent to commercial, possible disagreement there.
- 22 – North of Boulevard. This area is 1 du/80 ac on the working copy and proposed at 1 du/160 ac; we do not support this.
- Tecate – We have not verified whether the group wants to possibly change the Interest Group map to reflect existing uses. Tecate, Mexico is quite a large City and Tecate, USA is not, however, it does have a number of small commercial and medium industrial uses that we feel should be recognized as such. The working copy is what the community proposed and we do see the need to recognize existing uses out there. We do not know if this is necessarily a disagreement with the Interest Group map or not; we just flagged it.
- Pauma Valley—When we met with the groups individually, proposals ranged all over the place so both sides need to meet, look at the map, and give comments and feedback.
- Scarborough stated that before the group votes on the map, she would like to finish standards, which will probably be on Nov. 5th. Mitigation will be presented and we will potentially come back to the map after we have understood standards, at the Nov. 19th meeting.

b) Questions

- Whalen asked if the numbered areas are where staff is taking issue with the Interest Group map and if the ones that were mentioned were all of them. Carmichael responded that these are not all of them, just the major ones; there are minor ones that still may have a difference on our final map. Whalen stated that the group will want to see the minor issues as well. Carmichael gave an example of a minor issue in the area of Jamul—proposed at 1 du/80 ac on the Interest Group map and 1 du/40 ac on the working copy—it probably would not be a serious problem if it went to 1 du/80 ac but the community would take a big issue with it.
- Shibley mentioned that areas in the backcountry did not take parcelization into account and that some communities west of I-15 should take densities. Holler responded by describing the overall context, several of the communities—Ramona, Fallbrook, Bonsall, Valley Center, and Lakeside—

saw increases in density as are proposed on the map, as well as, areas such as Potrero, Jamul, and Boulevard, who saw decreases in density. In some of these areas you see lower densities, in some of the other communities you see higher densities.

- Gendron mentioned that if staff is planning on taking into consideration what is in Tecate now, there are number of zoning violations and if these are taken into consideration, it will have an impact on Hwy 94 with a commercial increase in both Tecate and Potrero. Carmichael responded that we are definitely taking truck traffic issues into consideration and that recognizing what is there does not affect traffic. Gendron mentioned that there is some bio sensitivity there.
- Bowlby asked if the transportation analysis was going forward based on the current Interest Group map or after revisions are made. Holler replied that the map needs to be revised before the transportation model can be run. Pryor added that the traffic modeling is on hold until we get this map as close as we can.
- Bowlby asked if there was a no growth alternative presented by the community of Ramona and what the differences were in terms of population. Carmichael responded that Ramona does not have a unified position yet; one fraction of Ramona, a few years ago, floated a map that would have been a no growth alternative but they have not fully endorsed that and the group as it stands now still wants to work on the map. Bowlby asked if staff was referring to the 52,000 population target as no growth. Holler responded that 52,000 was the target set by the group and that it was a map recommended by the community in the past that resulted in a much lower total than that.
- Larson asked if it was fair to say that there has been no adjustments to that map yet based on individual property owners' requests. Pryor responded that that is not true because staff does look at requests when they are received and do attempt to see how we could get them to line up with what we are doing. In some cases, we can and in others, they are asking for something that we do not think is reasonable; we have landowners who are likely to come in and say they want to be upzoned because they plan on developing the land and do not want to have to do a general plan amendment. We are dismissing those kinds of requests because they are purely based on an individual's desire and not for the betterment of the community at large. Added that staff is keeping record of all requests and all requests are considered.
- Adams asked about the kind of dialogue that is taking place to address the concerns of communities like Alpine, who have a different take in what they want to see in relation to the map. Holler responded that staff has met with Alpine in the community at the planning group level and that he has also met with members of the planning group to talk through some of their concerns. Some of the concerns break down between the FCI areas and the eastern parts of their community. Pryor added that the one thing we are not going to do is make a change for a request that will put this entire process at risk in terms of a legal action. We have made that very clear and FCI is one of those issues that we have said puts us in dangerous territory. Added that it is up to the planning group if they want to fight it at the Board, but as far as the department is concerned, we have a larger mission here in terms of trying to get a general plan for this county that the majority of the populace can agree upon and support; so there are a couple of key points that we will not give in.

Agenda Item III: Resource Standards –

a) Steep Slopes

- Holler stated that the Steering Committee had originally proposed yield reductions on steep slopes across many more designations than what we have today; they have actually extended up to the higher density areas that would occur in the village and in some cases, the core area. The Steering Committee has changed that position to what is seen on the handout. We took the different categories and proposed different solutions to them. Staff's position is that in core areas and in village areas, areas where we are proposing to put growth and development, should not have impediments to locating higher density housing such that you would with slope dependent designations. At the same time, in the rural lands, the density is so low that there is no need to even start the discussion again with the slope reductions.

- Pryor mentioned the original intent behind the slope dependent categories, where the slope increased the lot size – the theory behind that was not necessarily to reduce the yield but to reduce the number of houses lined up on the steeper slopes. This proposal does not necessarily address that so you can achieve both in a different fashion. If the real issue is to try to get a yield and accommodate that yield but not on the slopes, another way of doing that is not by subtracting the number of houses but by limiting the number that goes on the slopes respectively; try to move development off the steeper slopes/ridgelines. That is a different issue than reducing the density. When we were trying to get the planning groups to understand the difference between a parcel based plan and a density based plan, they were having trouble grasping how you were going to translate one into the other. If you assume that a lot equals 100% development and it is 2 acres and you go to a 4 acre lot, you go to 50% of the same number of houses but you have twice the size of the lot and if you go to an 8 acre size you wind up with another corresponding reduction in the amount of rooftops you get in that same area. We used that as an illustration on how this lot area size actually relates to the number of rooftops, which the steering Committee took as our slope categories for reduction. That is perfectly permissible but if the intent is to keep them off the slope, this does not necessarily do that; all this says is that you are going to reduce the number of houses and you can stick it all up there if you wanted to. If the intent is to try to keep them off the slope, then reduction is not the method to use. You really have to go to the intent of what that slope dependent category meant and it was a protection in trying to keep roofs off of the steeper slopes.
- Silver stated that he wanted to put another proposal on the table. Mentioned that design guidelines are critical to the discussion here, asked if we can get serious about clustering, and stated the concept of the least environmentally sensitive portion of the site. Thinks that you would not have to have any encroachment limits or prohibition on grading if the least environmentally sensitive portion of the site comprehensively is identified, but it is really predicated on really doing it. Prepared an option and distributed it.
- Whalen had also prepared an option and distributed it. He agrees that there should not be a fixation on lot sizes but stated that it then raises a lot of questions, for example, sewage treatment. Asked if it can be used for small development projects even if they are “dinky” because it gives you a lot more flexibility in design. Asked if alternate septic systems will be allowed to facilitate clustered projects vs. sewer package treatment. There is a lot of stuff going on in areas where sewage treatment is not the best way it should be done.
- Adams was interested in how the base development percentage was determined in Silver's proposal and if there has been a situation where there was clustering in the least environmentally sensitive area that went above this particular percentage and would not be able to build all of the units. Silver responded that he tried to match what seemed like a real appropriate lot size; it is a concept that tries to introduce the requirement of mandatory clustering.
- Adams stated that he is okay with the concept of clustering but is supportive of incentives to clustering because we also have to recognize the marketplace out there and has concerns on the mandatory component. He asked if he would be subject to yield if he wanted to put units on the slope. Pryor responded that the way he had proposed it, it would not reduce the yield in any way. You could simply say that 25% of your yield is allowed on this slope but as it gets steeper, you may be able to put only 10%. You do not lose the units because you can put it on the flatter area; you just have to distribute them on the slope and on the flat land at some ratio but you still have full yield.
- Lambron stated that design standards are important because there are situations where steep slopes are the only buildable areas as the biology may be on the flat land.
- Tabb asked if design standards were architectural guidelines. Pryor replied that there are two types of design guidelines. RPO is a design guideline; it changes lot sizes and reconfigures subdivisions based on certain parameters. RPO and BMO really are a set of subdivision guidelines and they are often called standards but not we call them the Resource Protection Ordinance, but in reality they all shape the kinds of development. He added that he would change the jargon to subdivision guidelines.
- Pryor mentioned that this is a process that is going to move into finer and finer details and that we are ultimately going to wind up with a suggestion for an approach, that in order to get this plan implemented, will need to have flexible road standards established.

- Stedt stated that if we are going to go with a density-based plan, which we have been and he agrees with, we do not need to start reusing density a second time through steep slopes and other resources. Does not think our standards need to be based on a density reduction formula. Thinks what Silver is saying about clustering and design could be a potential part of where we are going as mandatory ways of getting there but we are a density-based program
- Messer stated that there is some overlap between Whalen's and Silver's proposals and thinks this may be a win-win situation. Liked Whalen's distinction between a grading footprint and a total development footprint and thinks we need to address the road standards; Silver has written clustering requirements that needed to be done. The most important thing that has come out of this discussion is the approach to avoidance that takes everything into account at once. Agrees with the yield reduction but thinks we may need to strengthen the avoidance requirements. Stedt stated that we should not double take.

d) Floodplains

- One of the things that we realized is that this issue is fairly complex and after we put this together, we did not think that we were entirely comfortable with how we captured the issue; so the proposal right now has no encroachment, we are talking about the avoidance issue.
- If we have two parcels and one has a floodplain area and the other is entirely floodplain, one of the things we have not addressed is encroachment into a floodplain or the percentage of fill of the floodplain with development. What we have said here is somewhat problematic with the encroachment and yield reduction; essentially, we are not saying what portion of the floodplain you can build on. If you come in and fill a certain area, you could really change the hydrology and change the natural functioning of the floodplain. We have not fully captured it but we are putting it on the table.
- Silver stated that he has tried to think about these issues. Mentioned allowable use, encroachment, and how much to fill; have to mitigate the impacts of fill. Took a different approach than what staff did on the yield reduction because he had no yield reduction in the village/village core, figuring that is where we want the people; kept the yield reduction in the rural/semi-rural.
- Stedt stated there is a technical way to deal with these floodplains but he is not convinced that there should be any density reduction because we should be assigning appropriate densities in those areas to begin with.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comments –

- Ductch Van Dierendonck stated that we cannot continue to grow in certain areas, like Ramona, until we address the infrastructure – the lack of it and the need to get away from the LOS E and F.
- Lynne Baker stated that the current densities that were applied were applied with the yield reduction model so if there were changes made, densities would also need to be changed.